Review of FGDC standards program of work Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards - Part 1: Reporting Methodology

1. What's the problem (issue) that the standard is trying to address?

The issue may be inferred from the scope and objective, as stated in Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards - Part 1: Reporting Methodology, http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/projects/FGDC-standards-projects/accuracy/part1/index_html.

What are the complementary standards (voluntary or accepted) that support this standard?

Framework Data Standard

- a. If the standard refers to other standards, have the referenced standards changed in a way that requires changes to this standard?

 No
- b. Since this standard was adopted or last reviewed, have new standards been adopted elsewhere that should be referenced in this standard?

```
ISO 19113:2002, Geographic information -- Quality principles ISO 19114:2003, Geographic information -- Quality evaluation procedures
ISO 19114/Cor. 1, Geographic information -- Quality evaluation procedures -- Corrigendum 1
ISO/DTS 19138, Geographic information -- Data quality measures
```

2. What standard(s) does/do this FGDC standard support?

Parts 2-5 of Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards Spatial Data Transfer Standard Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata

3. Are the standards in active use?

No

- 4. Is the standard a 'Government Unique Standard'? Yes.
 - a. If so, has it been examined to see if Voluntary Consensus Standards might now be in place?
 - i. If a corresponding Voluntary Consensus Standard exists, should the Consensus standard be considered for adoption to replace the existing standard?

No existing Voluntary Consensus Standard can replace this standard.

ii. If a corresponding Voluntary Consensus Standard does not exist, should this standard be moved to a national standard?

NGS is "sheepish" about advancing standard as an American National Standard until it is actively used.

b. Is it appropriate to remain in FGDC? Why or why not?

NGS is satisfied that it remain in FGDC.

- 5. Who are the important stakeholders that need input into the review of this standard?
 - a. Which Federal agencies in addition to the agency with maintenance authority should the review committee include?
 - b. Which non-Federal agencies should the review committee include?

No mature user community among Federal users or anyone.

6. Are there editorial errors that you are aware of since this FGDC standard was endorsed?

Yes, as noted in comments.

7. Are there technical errors or technical changes that you are aware since this FGDC standard was endorsed?

Yes, vague in some areas, could be better described.

Review of FGDC standards program of work Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards - Part 1: Reporting Methodology

Based on your answers to the above, the sponsor team recommends the following:

1. The standard to be issued with no modifications. Justification:

2. The standard to be revised. Justification:

Editorial comments.

Specifically: NGS to submit revised standard, while Maitra has action to submit revised cover pages.

Specifically:

3. The standard to be changed. Justification:

Specific areas of concern:

4. The standard to be withdrawn. Justification: